

## WM2016 Conference Panel Report

**PANEL SESSION 78:**      **Panel: US DOE Procurements and Contractor Delivery Challenges**

**Co-Chairs:**              **Cathy Hickey, CH2M**  
**John Longenecker, Longenecker & Associates**

**Panel Reporter:**        **Shannon Farrell, CH2M**

### Panelists:

1. **Jack Surash**, *EM DAS for Acquisition and Project Management, US DOE EM*
2. **Andrew Wirkkala**, *Director, Office of Contract Assistance US, DOE*
3. **Ralph Holland**, *Deputy Director, Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center, US DOE*
4. **Kenneth Reuter**, *President, URS/CH2M Oak Ridge LLC*
5. **Greg Meyer**, *Senior Vice President, Environmental & Nuclear, Fluor Corporation*

About 75 people attended this panel session which focused on future US DOE Environmental Management procurements and process initiatives and contract implementation challenges. DOE procurement officials provided an update on future procurement opportunities and process improvement initiatives underway. Contractor Representatives discussed contract implementation trends and challenges.

### **Summary of Presentations**

**Jack Surash** presented on the current DOE procurements. DOE continues to focus on:

- Balancing tax payer dollars with contractor interests and needs,
- Better planning, and
- Using fixed price contracting when possible.

Mr. Surash briefly discussed the seven contracts DOE has awarded since last year. Those contracts include: the Hanford 222 – Lab Services contract, Paducah Infrastructure contract, the TRU Waste Processing Center contract, the Idaho NRC Facilities Management Clean-up contract, Carlsbad Technical Assistance Contract, Portsmouth Infrastructure contract, and the Idaho Clean-up Core contract. He also briefly discussed the procurement stages of the six contracts in Source Selection. Those contracts include: the Headquarters Information Technology contract – award at the end 2016; DUF6 – award in the summer 2016; the Savannah River Liquid Waste contract– award in Q1CY17, the Los Alamos Environmental Management contract – final RFP expected Q4FY16; the Paducah Deactivation and Remediation Services contract – draft RFP expected in April; and the Richland Plateau Remediation Contract and the Mission Support Contract – both of which are in the acquisition planning stages.

**Andrew Wirkkala** discussed the importance of teamwork between contract management and project management. Alignment of personnel at the Federal level and Contractor level must be kicked-off during transition. Contractors must communicate with their client. There needs to be a better understanding of terms and conditions on the Federal side and Contractor side.

## WM2016 Conference Panel Report

He discussed the 6 step change process for a contract change, WBS realignment modifications, and work scope modifications. Finally, Mr. Wirkkala presented on performance management and reporting, best practices, and contract administration - the contract needs to reflect work that can get done.

**Ralph Holland** presented on the history of the Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center (EMCBC) their mission, contracting services, and functions. He also presented on the current and future EM contract opportunities. He discussed the do's and don'ts of submitting a proposal – examples included, but are not limited to: DOE's need to support the technical approach, companies need to use their the proposal pages wisely (graphics sacrifice word count), companies shouldn't talk about their experience in the technical approach, companies should spend the majority of the page count and time on the highest scored criteria, and finally companies need to tell DOE how they're going to approach the work – don't feed back the RFP language back to DOE and don't assume DOE knows you.

**Kenneth Rueter** highlighted the East Tennessee Technology Park Contract. URS|CH2M Oak Ridge LLC (UCOR) is the contractor for DOE to carry out the ETTP mission. UCOR and DOE worked together during the contract true-up stage to establish alignment between the total estimated contract cost with the contract budget base. UCOR and DOE set the stage for maintaining alignment through the contract and the project execution stage. Mr. Rueter presented an example of a notional program schedule – 1) Plan the work during the partnering process, 2) work the plan, 3) keep a balanced score card.

**Greg Meyer** discussed what goes well and doesn't go well in proposal and contracts space. For example, the fee claw-back clause in the Idaho Clean-up Core contract Request for Proposal (RFP) was difficult for the contractor to accept, DOE listened to the contractor's comments during the draft RFP stage and changed the language in the Final RFP. Also, the annual performance change in CPARS was a good change. Proposals is an area that could be improved upon, for example proposals are too long and expensive - we need to figure out how to simplify the cost volumes. Finally, we need to manage the number of contract modifications - accountability for both the contractor and DOE is extremely important.